



OLD VALUES - NEW HORIZONS

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

3 North Lowell Road, Windham, New Hampshire 03087

(603) 432-3806 / Fax (603) 432-7362

www.WindhamNH.gov

Planning Board Minutes

February 19th, 2020

7:00 pm at Community Development Meeting Room

3 North Lowell Road

Attendance:

Chair, Paul Gosselin, Present
Vice Chair, Derek Monson, Present
Alan Carpenter, Present
Margaret Crisler, Excused
Joe Bradley, Present
Jennean Mason, Present
Kathleen DiFruscia (alternate), Excused
Matt Rounds (alternate), Excused
Gabe Toubia (alternate), Excused
Heath Partington, Board of Selectmen liaison, Present
Joel Desilets, Board of Selectmen liaison (alternative), Excused
Dick Gregory- Planning Board Director
Renee Mallett- Minute Taker

The meeting opened at 7:00 with the Pledge of Allegiance and the introduction of members. Chair Gosselin announced that Case 2020-4 has been withdrawn by the applicant and would not be heard.

Case 2020-1, Preliminary & Major Final Site Plan Application (lot 8-B-3000), 10 Libbey Rd. CDA District

Mr. Karl Dubay representing this application to add clean fill to the parcel located at 10 Libbey Road. Mr. Gregory confirmed that the plan was complete and appropriate for zoning. Mr. Dubay asked for a waiver of the preliminary hearing as this application was for fill only, no buildings or roads.

Mr. Carpenter made a motion to open Case 2020-1 for public hearing as a major final site plan. Vice Chair Monson seconded the motion. 6-0, the motion passed.

Mr. Dubay said the fill area being discussed was in the center of the parcel and there would be no WWPD impact. Silt barriers, which would be in place to combat erosion, were noted on the plans.

Mr. Bradley asked what the intent was in doing this soil preparation now instead of as part of a larger development plan. Mr. Dubay said the applicant has access to clean fill immediately and wanted to

take advantage of that. He did not want to wait for approval on the full plan or the permitting which would be part of that plan.

Mr. Partington asked about HD/HC comments regarding stone walls. Mr. Dubay explained that formerly there was a structure on the property which placed it on the town's historic site list. However, the building had been removed many years ago and the list was never updated to reflect that. Ms. Wendy Williams, chair of the HD/HC, had walked the property and noted some stones remaining from an old wall as well as an old well. It is expected that when the property is developed the pieces of the old stone wall will be reused in some way onsite.

Mr. Carpenter asked if the lot would be clear cut corner to corner. Mr. Dubay said that there were trail easements deeded where the parcel would not be cut. Otherwise trees would be surveyed and flagged. Mr. Carpenter confirmed that the applicant would not be removing any material at this stage, except for some topsoil that might be moved to another site.

Mr. Bradley questioned if it was worth it for the applicant to fill the parcel on the presumption that he would receive later approval. Mr. Carpenter asked for more detail on the silt sock being used as erosion control.

Chair Gosselin opened and closed the session to public comment.

Ms. Mason made a motion to approve Case 2020-1 as a major final site plan as presented. Mr. Carpenter seconded the motion. Mr. Partington questioned if a HISS soil waiver would be needed but because no structures are being built as part of this application it was unnecessary. 6-0, the motion passed.

Case 2020-2, Final Subdivision (Minor) Application, (lot 1-C-951) 124 Kendall Pond Road, Rural District

Mr. Shayne Gendron representing this application to subdivide a 2.7-acre lot with an existing home and garage into two single family lots. Mr. Gregory confirmed that the application was complete and appropriate for zoning.

Vice Chair Monson made a motion to open Case 2020-2 as a final subdivision. Ms. Mason seconded the motion. 6-0, the motion passed.

Mr. Gendron said the parcel had the frontage needed to be subdivided and that test pits showed it meets lot sizing requirements. No waivers or easements are being asked for. The Conservation Committee had no concerns about the subdivision.

Vice Chair Monson questioned if a shed located on the parcel met the setback requirements. It does not but the applicant is moving it or removing it so requirements will be met. Mr. Partington questioned the criteria for major subdivisions versus minor ones. Mr. Gregory said that he made the determination. Mr. Partington and Mr. Bradley said they would like to see a notation to that effect in the case file in the future.

Chair Gosselin opened the case to public comment.

Tyson Duve, 122 Kendal Pond Road, asked if there was a two-acre minimum lot size in town. He was told there was not, that lot sizing was based on the HISS soil calculations. Mr. Duve was not in favor of the plan, saying he bought his home with the expectation that all the homes in the area were already built and none would be added. He said that in the spring he gets heavy run off from the parcel. He asked that

the board keep the status quo and worried that the addition of another well would mean less water for abutters.

Janet Wheeler Saunders, 25 New Road, said she always welcomes new neighbors but not when it could harm the people already living in an area. Her home has a 50 year old block foundation that she is concerned could be damaged if blasting is used to build a home on the new lot. Ms. Wheeler said ledge would be found a foot and half down and worried that meant the foundation would have to be blasted. She noted a number of abutters on the map that she said had water issues or had already dug multiple wells.

Renee Mallett, 2 Bradford Road, was in favor of the application and welcomed more families being added to the neighborhood. Her home has had no water issues and she did not know of any other houses in the neighborhood who did.

Beverly Malcolm, 123 Kendal Pond Road, thanked the board for all the information they had given over the course of the meeting and expressed how interesting she found the planning board process to be.

Chair Gosselin closed the session to public comment.

In response to abutter comments Mr. Gendron repeated that there were no wetlands on the property. He said that sceptic design had not been completed and that the area marked on the application was where one might go. He said that test pits showed four feet of soil before ledge was hit and said that blasting was generally too expensive to be worthwhile for one house foundation. His expectation was that the foundation would be dug another way.

Mr. Duve addressed the board again to explain how the road was canted to cause the drainage that impacts his property.

Mr. Carpenter agreed that he also was not in favor of the plan but that the board was bound by the town ordinances and there was no technical reason to deny this application. He suggested that a berm or other visual barrier could be constructed to shield Ms. Wheeler's view of any visible sign of the sceptic system.

Chair Gosselin called the matter a double-edged sword, pointing out that he also preferred larger lot sizes but also liked the possibility of subdividing his land to create homesteads for his children in the future. Mr. Partington agreed that it was difficult to say no to an application that met every regulation in town.

Mr. Gendron said the applicant would nicely landscape the lot.

Mr. Carpenter made a motion to approve Case 2020-2 as presented. Vice Chair Monson seconded the motion. 6-0, the motion passed.

Mr. Carpenter paused the meeting to a make a public apology to Mr. Gendron. Referencing an earlier deliberative session regarding future warrant articles Mr. Carpenter said he felt he was in error when he had stated that 3 of the 4 plans shown by Mr. Gendron for the Clarke Farm North property would not meet current regulations. Mr. Carpenter said he had rethought the matter and feels now that statement was incorrect.

Case 2020-3, Major Final Site Plan Application (lot 13-C-400), 39 Roulston Rd. PBT District

136 Mr. Karl Dubay representing this application on behalf of Windham Woods to create a two-story,
137 9,295 square foot addition onto the school. Mr. Gregory confirmed the application was complete and that it
138 fit zoning.
139

140 **Ms. Mason made a motion to open Case 2020-3 as a major final site plan. Mr. Partington**
141 **seconded the motion. Vice Chair Monson disclosed that while his wife was not directly employed by the**
142 **school, she did work for a company that consults with Windham Woods and she is there one day a week.**
143 **He did not feel this would sway his opinion on the case and Chair Gosselin said there was nothing in the**
144 **regulations that would require him to recuse himself from the case. 6-0, the motion passed.**
145

146 Mr. Dubay introduced the architect for the project, Rob Hannon. Mr. Hannon walked the board
147 through his plans for the expansion of the school, which includes several classroom spaces and a large open
148 classroom space for music and art classes. The expansion will use the same materials as the existing
149 building. The plan has already been seen by Design Review. Mr. Dubay said that the plans also reflect the
150 comments received in the Keach memo.

151 Mr. Carpenter asked about fire suppression. He was told that the existing cistern has the capacity
152 to handle the new addition. The current septic system was also oversized and can handle the expansion but
153 there is a paperwork issue that needs to be resolved by the original designer. The plans will be amended to
154 show this.

155 Mr. Dubay said the land is level and has been previously disturbed. The school is not planning on
156 doing a lot of landscaping due to security concerns. Mr. Dubay explained the calculations used for parking
157 and is asking for a waiver.

158 Ryan DeJoy, head of Windham Woods, spoke to the traffic flow at the school and how it keeps cars
159 from lining up on Roulston Road. Because of the school's tiered drop off and pick up times, and small class
160 sizes, parking needs are minimal. He said that the school does not plan on ever having more than 125
161 students. Currently they are at 48. They do not use buses and have no need for large spaces for them.

162 Parking remained a subject of discussion. Mr. Carpenter noted that the plans showed a 200-seat
163 assembly room. It was explained that the addition called for an open space classroom roughly the size of
164 the planning board meeting room. The two hundred seat room is the great room that is used as a cafeteria.
165 Mr. Bradley was concerned that the parking was already constrained and now they were coming for an
166 expansion without adding any parking spaces. He questioned if the school ever has larger events like
167 parent/teacher conferences that would require more parking than their normal day to day operations. Mr.
168 Bradley also said they had to plan for the future, that the nature of the school could change, and he would
169 like to see where space would be reserved for parking if it was ever needed.

170 Mr. DeJoy said there were some current overflow parking areas, including a gravel road that
171 wrapped around the back of the school and a flat sports field. He felt the property afforded them a lot of
172 options for future parking. Mr. Dubay said he would work with staff to identify further parking options but
173 asked that they not be paved if they did not have to be.

174 Mr. Carpenter concurred with Mr. Bradley's statement that the use of land or the type of school
175 could change in the future. He did not think the plans fully reflected on the Keach memo. Mr. Carpenter
176 said he was not going to vote on gravel roads and fields being overflow parking without knowing their
177 walkability. He suggested a site walk was needed.

178 Chair Gosselin said he did not want to add unnecessary pavement when it was not needed but he
179 felt the plans needed to reflect how many cars could park on these overflow spaces. He also wanted TRC to
180 review the overflow spots.

181 Mr. DeJoy said they would be happy to do a site walk. He added that he had recently purchased an
182 adjoining lot and that it could offer a lot of overflow parking options. Mr. Carpenter said that they were

183 currently asking for more than a 33% reduction in parking and that it would be better to show on the plans
184 the full amount of parking but to note that they would not be paving all of them.

185
186 **Mr. Carpenter made a motion to schedule a site walk for 8:30am on March 7th and to continue**
187 **Case 2020-3 until 7:00pm on March 18th. Mr. Bradley seconded the motion. 6-0, the motion passed.**
188
189

190 **Old/New Business**

191
192 Vice Chair Monson and Mr. Carpenter had been invited to discuss the Planning Board warrant
193 articles with the Win-Dems. They said they read the articles and explained briefly what they meant but did
194 not take positions on them.

195
196 **Mr. Partington made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:34. Vice Chair Monson seconded the**
197 **motion. 6-0, the motion passed.**